5:12-cv-00076-JMC Date Filed 02/11/13 Entry Number 20 Page 1 of 2

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA ORANGEBURGDIVISION

Lisa Richards,	
) Civil Action No.: 5:12-cv-00076-JMC
Plaintiff,)
)
V.) OPINION AND ORDER
)
Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of)
Social Security Administration,	
)
Defendant.	
	_)

This matter is before the court for a review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report"), [Dkt. No. 15], filed on January 22, 2013, recommending that the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security ("the Commissioner") denying Plaintiff's claim for Disability Insurance Benefits ("DIB") and Supplemental Security Income ("SSI") be affirmed. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 D.S.C., the matter was referred for pretrial handling to United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West in which she recommended affirming the decision of the Commissioner because the decision was supported by substantial evidence. The Report sets forth the relevant facts and legal standards which this court incorporates herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or

5:12-cv-00076-JMC Date Filed 02/11/13 Entry Number 20 Page 2 of 2

recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The parties were notified of their right to file objections [Dkt. No. 15-2]. Plaintiff has not

filed any objections to the Report. In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report

and Recommendation, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the

recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the

absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead

must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the

recommendation." Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

(quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific

written objections to the Report and Recommendation results in a party's waiver of the right to

appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. §

636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985);

United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough and careful review of the record, the court finds the Magistrate Judge's

Report and Recommendation provides an accurate summary of the facts and law in the instant

case. The court ACCEPTS the Magistrate Judge's Report [Dkt. No. 15] and incorporates it

herein by reference. For the reasons set out in the Report, the Commissioner's final decision is

AFFIRMED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

J. Michalla Childs

United States District Judge

February 11, 2013

Greenville, South Carolina

2